**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDIATURE AT BOMBAY**
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.99 OF 2006
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.83 OF 2006

Smt.Geeta Prakash Parmar
@ P.P.Vakil, .. Applicant
Vs
The State of Maharashtra, .. Respondent

None for the applicant.
Mr S.R.Shinde, APP for the respondent.

**CORAM : D.B.BHOSALE, J.**

**DATED : 5th JUNE, 2006**

P.C.:

1. None appears for the applicant. Heard the learned APP for the respondent.

2. This application was adjourned in view of the statement made by the Advocate for the applicant that some co-accused have been granted bail. The court had granted leave to amend to annex the orders for bail. However, the amendment was not carried out till 3.5.06. On that date, time to carry out amendment was extended for two weeks. Despite that no amendment has been carried out till today. Today when the matter was called out none appeared for the applicant. I perused the judgment. The applicant has been convicted along with several other accused under sections 120(B) r/w 465,466,467,468, 465 r/w 471, 466

r/w 471, 467 r/w 471, 168 r/w 471, 170,419,450,395,397,412 IPC r/w 4, 25 (1-B)(b), 27 and 35 of Arms Act and sentenced to suffer R.I for seven years. The conviction is based on appreciation of evidence on record. The accused was not on bail pending trial. In my opinion, this is not a fit case to release the accused on bail at this stage. The application for bail is rejected.

. Liberty to the applicant to apply for bail if the appeal is not heard within one year from today.

(D.B.BHOSALE,J.)